



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Admistrative Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,866	12/24/2003	Eui-Sun Hong	1568.1082	9364
49455	7590	09/22/2008		EXAMINER
STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP 1400 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ECHELMAYER, ALIX ELIZABETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/22/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/743,866

**Applicant(s)**

HONG ET AL.

**Examiner**

Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer

**Art Unit**

1795

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: **1-10 and 13-15**

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/SUSY N TSANG-FOSTER/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not found to be convincing. Applicant argues, on page 6, that Ramaswami et al. do not teach that the anode portion is the entire "bottom" of the battery, after discussing on page 5 that it was indicated in the Final Rejection of July 9, 2008 that the anode was equated to the bottom. It appears that this is an issue of semantics, and this was discussed in the Final Rejection (see page 11). Claim 1, in the last two lines, requires "a layer ... provided only on an outer surface of the bottom portion of the can." The examiner interprets this limitation to mean that the layer is only on an outer surface of the bottom, not that the layer only exists on the bottom of the can, and then it is on the outer surface - hence, the rejection with the teachings of Ramaswami of a nickel layer that is on the outer surface on the bottom of the can and on an inner surface on the sides of the can (see Figure 1 of Ramaswami et al.) As for whether the anode is the "bottom" of the can, the orientation shown in the figures of Ramaswami et al. is used to show that the anode is interpreted as the bottom of the can; however, "bottom" is relative since batteries can be moved around and do not necessarily have to stay in a certain orientation, as is seen from Figures 2 and 3 of the instant invention, which show the "bottom" as the "top." As discussed in the Final Rejection, the teaching of Ramaswami et al. that the layer on the "bottom" of the can extends partially up the sides (Figure 1 of Ramaswami et al.) is considered within the context of the instant invention to be on the bottom of the can since it is seen in Figures 2 and 3 of the instant invention that the coating on the bottom surface of the can extends up the sides to a small extent.

As for Applicant's arguments pertaining to the motivation to combine Ramaswami et al. and Moriwaki et al., Applicant states that corrosion can occur not only on the bottom of the can but in places other than where the nickel layer is placed, and thus one of ordinary skill in the art would not put the layer only on the bottom of the can. Yet, it is seen from Figure 1 of Ramaswami et al. that the layer is only found on the outer surface of the bottom of the can, so it would follow that it is not preventing corrosion when the layer is covered by other materials.